<u>**REMARKS**</u>

Claims 1-7 and 9-41 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 4, 11, 16, 17, 20, 22, 29, 35, and 38 have been amended as shown at pages 2-8 of the Reply.

Applicants' Representative would like to thank Examiner Saint-Cyr for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview of June 27, 2008. Nilesh Amin and Jack Gau contacted the Examiner to discuss the Rejection of claims 1-41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). During the interview, the Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments would overcome the references cited in the Office Action. The novel aspect of an *inference component including a context analyzer component that provides an accurate translation that conforms to proper punctuation, syntax and semantics of the specified language* was discussed. Additionally, it was agreed that the proposed amendment regarding this aspect would overcome the cited references. Furthermore, these amendments have been incorporated into the claims as listed above and should overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   <u>**Rejection of Claims 1-7 and 9-41 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**</u>

Claims 1-7 and 9-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Park *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,951) in view of Liddy *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,221). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Liddy *et al.* and Park *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims.

Applicants' claimed subject matter relates to databases, and in particular, translating data and metadata stored therein. To this end, independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 11 and 20) recites an *inference component including a context analyzer component that provides an accurate translation that conforms to proper punctuation, syntax and semantics of the specified language*. Additionally, independent claim 22 (and similarly independent claim 29 and 35) recites a step of *utilizing context information to provide an accurate translation that conforms to proper punctuation, syntax, and semantics of the selected language*.

The claimed invention outputs a resulting translation that retains an operable language structure from the original content, preserving the relations between elements in a sentence. Thus, the claimed invention provides the advantage of translating at a highly detailed level, including proper punctuation, syntax, and semantics, enabling users of the target language to understand the translation with greater ease. Neither Liddy *et al.* or Park *et al.* suggest or disclose at least these novel aspects.

Independent claim 38 has been amended to recite *specifying a command in an unknown language, wherein the command is based at least in part on a user input; analyzing the command to determine a first language; receiving the command and translating the command into a second language; performing an operation on a database in accordance with the command; utilizing context information to translate the performance of the operation of a queried result to provide an accurate translation that conforms to proper punctuation, syntax, and semantics of the first language; and notifying the user of a degree of confidence that the translation is accurate.* The step of analyzing a command to determine a language allows foreign users to enter a command regardless of what languages they know, and maneuver as needed without selecting languages from a menu, wasting resource time. Additionally, after translation, the claimed invention provides the user with a degree of confidence that estimates the accuracy of the translated content, allowing the user to immediately identify suspect portions of translated content that may require correction, providing the advantage of saving a user time from analyzing an entire document by jumping to particular spots that have already been identified.

Liddy *et al.* relates to a document retrieval system where a user enters a query, retrieves documents from a database, and performs a surface-level, gloss transliteration of the text. However, a surface level gloss transliteration fails to provide *an accurate translation that conforms to proper punctuation, syntax and semantics of the specified language*, only giving users enough to gain a basic understanding of the document's contents. The cited reference discloses that documents highly relevant to the searcher would be considered for further translation. Liddy *et al.* also discloses language independent conceptual representations of documents. Again, this further emphasizes the point that the cited reference has failed to provide a high level *accurate translation that conforms to proper punctuation, syntax and semantics of the specified language*, because language independent representations fail to account for

elements clearly recited within the claims, such as punctuation, syntax, and semantics. Liddy *et al.* discloses disambiguation of polysemous words based on local context, domain knowledge and global information, and simply selects a term while failing to account for *an accurate translation that conforms to proper punctuation, syntax and semantics of the specified language.*

With regard to independent claim 38, Liddy *et al.* fails to disclose *specifying a command in an unknown language, wherein the command is based at least in part on a user input; analyzing the command to determine a first language; receiving the command and translating the command into a second language; performing an operation on a database in accordance with the command; utilizing context information to translate the performance of the operation of a queried result to provide an accurate translation that conforms to proper punctuation, syntax, and semantics of the first language; and notifying the user of a degree of confidence that the translation is accurate.* Thus, Liddy *et al.* does not provide the advantage of saving a user time by analyzing a command to determine the target translation language. Furthermore, the cited reference is silent with regard to a degree of accuracy for the translation.

Park *et al.* relates to a multilingual query transformation system, and in particular, the cited reference discloses document retrieval techniques that enable a user to enter a query in a supported language, and retrieve documents from a database composed of documents in at least one other language than in which the query was entered. Unlike the claimed subject matter, Park *et al.* discloses that it is unnecessary to modify the information retrieval system and that it is only necessary to add a multilingual query transformation system. Park *et al.* discloses transforming a query from a first language into a second language and executing the transformed query. However, Park *et al.* fails to disclose the novel element of providing *an accurate translation that conforms to proper punctuation, syntax and semantics of the specified language.* Park *et al.* fails to provide the advantage of retaining an operable language structure from the original content that preserves the relations between elements in a sentence, giving readers a high level translation detailed enough to include proper punctuation, syntax, and semantics. Thus, the claimed invention outputs a translation that enables users to read with a greater amount of ease because *an accurate translation that conforms to proper punctuation, syntax and semantics of the specified language* is easier to understand.

Park *et al*. fails to disclose *specifying a command in an unknown language, wherein the command is based at least in part on a user input; analyzing the command to determine a first language; receiving the command and translating the command into a second language; performing an operation on a database in accordance with the command; utilizing context information to translate the performance of the operation of a queried result to provide an accurate translation that conforms to proper punctuation, syntax, and semantics of the first language; and notifying the user of a degree of confidence that the translation is accurate*, with regard to independent claim 38.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants' Representative respectfully submits that Liddy *et al*. and Park *et al*. fail to teach or suggest each and every element of Applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP605US]

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731